

Weekly Times.

ISAAC N. PATRIDGE and
LYRON B. HOLLISTER, EDITORS.
HOLLY SPRINGS:

Thursday, Sept. 18, 1856.

AMERICAN NOMINATIONS FOR 1860:

FOR PRESIDENT,
MILLARD FILLMORE,
OF NEW YORK.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
ANDREW J. DONELSON,
OF TENNESSEE.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.

STATE AT LARGE.

WILLIAM L. SHARKEY, OF IOWA,
J. H. R. TAYLOR, OF MARSHALL.

DISTRICTS.

B. D. NABERS, OF TIPPAN;
W. A. SHAW, OF CINCINNATI;
W. D. LYLES, OF NOBLES;
E. M. YEGER, OF ALABAMA;
JAMES A. NENTRESS, OF WILKINSON.

Public Speaking.

JOHN F. SALL, Esq., of Memphis, will address the people of Marshall county at the Court House in this town, on Tuesday evening, 23d inst., at early candle light, in favor of the election of Fillmore and Donelson. All are invited to attend.

The Democratic Candidate for Vice President Taking the Stump for Squatter Sovereignty!

Mr. Breckenridge, the candidate of the Cincinnati Convention for Vice President, has taken the stump in the North-Western States for himself and "Old Buck." He is attempting to build up the waning cause of Democracy, by making concessions to the Abolitionists. He has unqualifiedly endorsed Squatter Sovereignty—a doctrine which will as effectually deprive the South of her equal rights in the Territories as the Wilmot proviso. In a speech delivered at Tippecanoe, Indiana, which is published in the Cincinnati Enquirer, a Democratic paper, we find the following extract:

"The speaker had heard it charged that the fifteen slave States were conspiring to obtain entire possession of the General Government, with a view of bringing its power to bear to extend and perpetuate their 'peculiar institutions.' Gentlemen, there has been no such attempt. I am convinced that no party that has for its object the extension of slavery, nor with any to prevent the people of a State or territory from deciding the question of its existence or non-existence with them for themselves.

"The speaker continued: I happened to be in Congress when the Kansas Nebraska bill passed, and gave it my voice and my vote, and because it did what it did, viz: It acknowledged the right of the people of the Territory to settle the question for themselves, and not because I supposed, what I do not now believe, that it legislated slavery into the Territory. The Democratic party is not a pro-slavery party—it is neither pro-slavery nor anti-slavery."

Thus it will be seen, both candidates on the Democratic ticket have endorsed this odious doctrine, and Mr. Breckenridge says he helped to pass the Kansas bill, and knows that this monstrous imposition on the South was in the bill. Let the South beware of the Cincinnati nominees!

Mr. Fillmore on Squatter Sovereignty.

Col. John P. Pryor, editor of the Memphis Eagle and Enquirer, recently addressed a letter to Joseph S. Williams, in relation to the substance of a conversation which Mr. W. had with Mr. Fillmore on the subject of Squatter Sovereignty. The following is the letter of Col. Williams in reply to Mr. Pryor:

MEMPHIS, Sept. 12, 1856.

Col. J. P. PRYOR:—Dear Sir:—Your note of this instant, asking, for publication, the substance of a conversation between John Millard Fillmore and myself, upon the subject of "Squatter or Territorial Sovereignty," has just been handed me. I cheerfully comply with your request, as I was placed under no restraint by him in reference to the matter.

Upon my return home from the North, I called to see Mr. Fillmore at his home in Buffalo, New York, on the 4th inst. During our conversation, I asked him what he thought of "Squatter Sovereignty," and in reply, he entered upon a free and unreserved expression of his views. He said he was decidedly opposed to this doctrine, as advocated by Cass, Douglas, Buchanan, Van Buren and others; he believed that a Territory, until its inhabitants were sufficiently numerous to authorize the formation of a State Constitution, preparatory to admission into the Union as a State, could only be regarded as in a condition of pupillage, possessing no sovereignty whatever; and referred to the Utah and New Mexico Territorial bills, sanctioned by him, as a correct indication of his opinions.

I was gratified to find that Mr. Fillmore occupied the same position upon this question which is maintained by the American party in the South, and by the whole band of national Americans of the North, headed by such men as Fuller, of Pennsylvania; Haven, of New York; and others, and I told him I would like to be at liberty to speak of the explanation received from him. He replied he had expressed the same views to others, and that I could make such use of them as I thought proper. Yours truly,

JOSEPH S. WILLIAMS.

Col. Williams, the writer of the foregoing statement, is a planter of Louisiana, and a gentleman of high character and standing, both in that State and in Tennessee, where he formerly resided. No one who knows him will question what he says.

This is a bold and unqualified repudiation of the monstrous doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty. Nons of Mr. Fillmore's supporters believed, we are sure, that a doctrine so well calculated to destroy the equality of the States could have received the slightest favor from him. Can Southern men longer believe in a man to whom they will support?

There are several articles in the last Democrat devoted to the Times, which we cannot notice this week, but shall devote some little space to them in our next. We have a better use for our columns than to keep them constantly filled up with exposures of the palpable errors of the Democrat.

Mr. Benton's Speech in Memphis.

The speech of our fellow-townman, Hon. Samuel Benton, in Memphis, is spoken of on all hands as a masterly and statesmanlike effort. The following article from the Eagle and Enquirer indicates the effect which his speech had upon the audience:

"The speech of Hon. Samuel Benton, of Mississippi, at Odd Fellows Hall, in this city, on Wednesday evening last, was one of the greatest triumphs of cool, calm, dispassionate discussion we have ever witnessed. It seems to be admitted on all hands—by Whigs, Americans and Democrats—that it was the best reasoned speech, so far, of the century. With no rhetorical flourishes, with out passion, without 'theatrical effect,' but by the mere power of undeniable facts and unanswerable logic, he created a glow of enthusiasm, a furor of feeling, among the friends of Fillmore, Donelson and the Union, rarely seen in the most excited Presidential campaigns."

At the outset, Mr. Benton, seems dry and hard; but as he progresses, slowly and deliberately like Pata, he brings forward such a continuous and striking array of facts—so continuous and striking a group of political contrasts—that the attention of the most indifferent is attracted; and ultimately, by the sheer force of right reason and inflexible fact, he rises absolutely into the sublime. Unquestionably, he is as well posted a politician as lives in the United States. Along with this, he has what is called an "affidavit face"—earnest and true in every line—which would make you take the facts for "grape" were not those facts always backed up by "records" which no man dare dispute.

Mr. Benton is an Old-Line Whig—never joined the American Order—but is an ardent supporter of Millard Fillmore, whom he vindicates with more complete success than any speaker who has yet appeared before a Memphis audience. In 1851, Mr. Benton fought the battle of the Union and the Compromise in Mississippi, and fought it victoriously—and now, unbiased by party, unswayed by the hope of power or place, he has come forth to fight the same battle again in 1856, under the same leader—the brave "Model President."

We do not propose to follow Mr. Benton through his speech. Most of our readers have had, or will have, an opportunity of hearing him. It is sufficient, here to say, that his speech was well sustained in every part. It commenced like a little stream and ended like a Mississippi. He fought the pseudo-Democracy with a "coming appetite." We heard one Anti-American Democrat say it was the best speech he ever heard; and another said it was the best ever made in Old Fellows Hall; another, that it was the most cautious and statesmanlike ever made upon the stump; and another said he had "always" supported Sam Benton as a sort of "Whig humbug" until he heard that speech."

All this is highly complimentary, and shows that there are some even among the Modern Democracy who cannot withstand the all-powerful logic of facts and truth. Add to these compliments, however, that Mr. Benton is a young man; that he is no professional politician; that his moral and political outlook is that of a sturdy and spotless honest man; and that withal, courteous and "mild-mannered" beyond comparison, he is yet as brave and true as any knight that ever fought beneath a plumed helmet. It needs no prophetic feat to predict for him a brilliant future, whenever there shall be a return to the Jeffersonian standard of fitness for public confidence.

"They Love the Treason, But Hate the Traitor."

Charley Fontaine has recently declared for "Buck and Breck." To show how his allies like his connection with them, we invite attention to the following extracts from an article in the Oxford Signal, a Democratic paper. After referring to the fact, that Mr. Fontaine had come out for Buchanan, the Signal says:—

"But who expected it otherwise? A man who could desert the Democratic party, and fall in with an arrant humbug as Know Nothingism, simply because it gave him the assurance of office, might certainly be expected to return to the more powerful party, after learning how cheaply he was sold. Such a man, too, may again be expected to quit, unless paid to remain with us, and mount the very next donkey of a party which passes along, provided an inducement of something like 'thirty pieces' be held out."

"But to return to Charley—we are very far from congratulating him or our party on his return. We might, if we choose, congratulate the Know Nothing party on the occasion; but we leave that to themselves to do. His party is the Democratic party, was never as great as his own aspirations; and, for the future, it will be beautifully lessened by the party which he has just forsaken, of course he will be denounced as a great 'humbug' from the beginning; and this, although a declaration of Know Nothingism, we see nothing from which to desert."

After this terrible exhortation, from one of his new allies, we hope to hear no more puffing and blowing over the tremendous blow which Fontaine has struck at Mr. Fillmore's prospects. The Signal well says, it might congratulate the American party in getting rid of him. A man who looks out for the strongest side only, cannot have much weight with his own party, and his defection would be a triumph.

Charley has written a letter defining his position. He has been halting between two opinions for some time, and his letter is the first satisfactory indication of what he intends to do, that has seen the light. He makes an exceedingly lame attempt to defend his course.

"Thus do all traitors; If their purgation did consist in words, They are as innocent as grace itself."

The Canvass in this District.

The appointments of the Electors for this district appear in our paper this week. We learn that Mr. Nabors is detained at home in consequence of sickness in his family, and that, by request, Gen. Henry E. Williamson, of this town, has consented to fill several of the appointments of Mr. Nabors. Gen. W. is fully competent to cope with Mr. Cushman, and will no doubt do justice to the cause he advocates.

Vote on the Case from Memphis.—A friend has handed us the following vote taken on the case between Memphis and Holly Springs, on Tuesday last:—

On the Memphis and Charleston Road.—For Fillmore, 32 gentlemen and 7 ladies; For Buchanan, 21 gentlemen and 4 ladies.

On the Mississippi Central Road.—For Fillmore 15; for Buchanan 11.

This is but an indication of popular sentiment. In at least two-thirds of the votes thus taken, Fillmore beats "Old Buck," and the ladies—God bless 'em—are for Fillmore and the Union. Who would be against the ladies?

Perversion of the Record.

The Democrat asserted a few weeks ago, that Mr. Fillmore voted to repeal a law of the territory of Florida, which prevented the migration of free negroes into that territory.

We referred then to the record and showed that Mr. Fillmore's vote was simply a vote on a motion to suspend the rules. The Democrat comes back at us again last week, and asserts that one month or more before he gave the vote above spoken of, Mr. Fillmore voted against laying on the table a motion to repeal the law above mentioned. Now, we assert that Mr. Fillmore gave no such vote. The Democrat took particular pains not to mention the volume and page of the record where this could be found, but we have managed to lay our eyes on it. We have the Congressional Globe for 1843 before us, and we find on page 108, in the proceedings of the 3d of January the record to which the Democrat refers. The resolution of Mr. Morgan was simply to enquire into the expediency of repealing the law of Florida to which we have referred. And the vote of Mr. Fillmore can only be construed into a vote in favor of the judiciary committee considering whether it would be expedient or not to repeal the law. The Democrat and the record disagree—we shall be pardoned for believing the record. Our neighbor has been imposed on; he copied his information from some of the less scrupulous Buchanan organs, and publishes it for the truth, which the record shows it is not. He talks about "letting down the gap" and "putting up the bars behind us," and inquires, whether we do not look innocent? We shall leave that to the public to decide. But we submit that he will not look innocent until he explains this palpable perversion of the public records of the country merely to sustain a trivial charge against a faithful public servant.

"The Democrat attempts to break the force of an extract copied by us from the Washington Union, in which that journal declared that a man might oppose the extension of slavery and not sin against the Democratic faith, by copying an extract from the Times published some months ago, in which we particularly referred to the abstract question of slavery. The extract from the Times does not come within a hunter's halloo of the extract from the Union, and we imagine that no sensible reader of the Democrat will fail to perceive that our neighbor in a desperate attempt to get out of a tight place committed the blunder of thinking them synonymous."

Mr. Buchanan on the Missouri Compromise.

Since the Democracy are finding so much fault with Mr. Fillmore, because he declared that he was opposed to the repeal of the Missouri line, we would like to call their attention to the following recorded sentiments of James Buchanan, in favor of that line, which they have suddenly discovered was an outrageous encroachment on the rights of the South.

On the 24th Aug. 1847, writing to the people of Berks county, he said:—"It is not for the descendants of either party of the present generation to cancel this solemn compact, that under the Missouri Compromise slavery was forever prohibited North of 36 deg. 30 min., and * * * in my opinion the harmony of the States and even the security of the Union itself require that the line of the Missouri Compromise should be EXTENDED TO ANY NEW TERRITORY WHICH WE MAY ACQUIRE FROM MEXICO."

He offered a sentiment at the close of his letter as follows:—"The Missouri Compromise—its adoption in 1820 saved the Union from threatened convulsion; its extension in 1848 to any new territory which we may acquire, will secure the like happy result."

On the 25th of April, in the Senate of the United States, he said:

"He regarded this COMPROMISE, considering the exciting and alarming circumstances under which it was made, and the dangers to the existence of the Union which it has removed, to be almost as sacred as a constitutional provision."

On the 21st of August, 1848, in a letter to Sanford, of Mobile, he said:

"Having urged the adoption of the Missouri Compromise, the inference is irresistible that Congress in my opinion possesses the power to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories. What an absurdity would it then be to while asserting that SOVEREIGN POWER IN CONGRESS, which power its nature must be EXCLUSIVE, I should in the very same breath also claim this identical power 'for the population of a Territory in an unorganized capacity.'"

"In conclusion I desire to reiterate and reaffirm every sentiment contained in my Berks county letter. I cling to the Missouri Compromise with greater tenacity than ever, and get firmly believe that it will be adopted by Congress."

In the spring of 1856, when the fruit now ripening was in bloom, in a letter to Senator Slidell, he said:

"The question has been settled by Congress, and this settlement should be inflexibly maintained. The Missouri Compromise is gone forever. But no assault should be made upon Democrats who maintained it, provided they are now willing in good faith to maintain the settlement as it exists. Such an understanding is wise and just in itself."

"It is well known how I labored in company with Southern men to have this line extended to the Pacific."

Now, isn't he a gloriously consistent Anti-Missouri Compromise Democrat? Opposed to the Compromise Measures in 1850, because he loved the Missouri line so well and in favor of the Compromise in 1856, because the Missouri line was an outrage on the South. Glorious Democrat! Most consistent politician! Mr. Buchanan says in his letter to Mr. Slidell, "no fault should be made upon Democrats who maintained the line," and the party are following his advice; but they do not fail to lavish their abuse on Americans who were in favor of maintaining it. Let the Democrat ponder!

A Question for the Times.

As the Times condemns the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, is it in favor of a restoration of that measure? Will it answer yes or no—Democrat.

NO! The editor of the Democrat is certainly very obtuse not to have discovered this before.

Now, let us put a question to you, Mr. Democrat. Would you be in favor of a dissolution of the Union if that line should be restored, when in 1851 you were in favor of dissolving the Union because you could not obtain more of it than even the Black Republicans are in favor of?

Yes or no!

Another Base Lie Exposed!

It has been currently circulating for some time that the American party of Indiana had fused with the Black Republicans of that State, by adopting their electoral ticket. The Nashville Union having been industrious in giving wings to the falsehood, the editor of the Nashville Banner wrote to the editor of the New Albany Tribune for a statement of the facts. Upon the receipt of the letter, the Tribune called the Legislature at once, by publishing the American and Black Republican tickets, showing that they are totally distinct and different—not one man of the latter upon the former, and vice versa. Having once asserted that the American and Black Republican parties are the same, Sag Nichtigman seems resolved that they shall be so, at every hazard for political purposes.

H. A. Wise on "Old Bachelors."

We extract the following paragraph from a speech delivered in Congress some years ago by Henry A. Wise, the present Democratic Executive of Virginia:

"I never will vote, knowingly, for a President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, who will appoint an old bachelor to a responsible office. Such a one cannot choose but an imbecile—a vis inertia—a withered figure, from which no fruit worth having can be gathered or expected."

We presume then, that if Mr. Wise votes for Mr. Buchanan, he will not do it knowingly. But, perhaps, his "gizzard foot" excellently makes a distinction between a bachelor President, and a bachelor appointed to office by a President. It is rather a difficult matter to keep up with Democratic ethics, particularly when expounded by Wise.

Whig Convention.

The National Convention of the Whig party met in Baltimore yesterday. There is no doubt but it declared in favor of Millard Fillmore and the Union. The effect of this nomination will be to unite the straight Whigs on Mr. Fillmore, thereby placing him before the country as the man most likely to defeat the designs of the Black Republicans and saving the country from the shock of Fremont's election.

Another Veteran Whig for Fillmore.

A Letter from Gen. A. B. Bradford, of Maine, to the Hon. of Washington, cheer and Buena Vista.

We publish today a letter from that noble old "wheel-horse" of the Whig party in Mississippi, Gen. ALEX. B. BRADFORD, to the editor of this paper, declaring his intention to support Mr. Fillmore, and giving his reasons for his course. Gen. Bradford's character, and his services to his country both in war and in peace, are well known throughout the Union. He has been a leading member of the Whig party in his State, through evil as well as through good report, and in the present confusion of parties, when he might, if he so desired, have gone over to the strong party in his State, he spurs the inducements, and bravely throws himself into the breach, for "Fillmore, Donelson and the Union." Gen. B. has grown almost gray in the service of his country and his party, and that, too, when there was no hope or prospect of reward; and now, in the calm repose of private life, he still "had rather be right" than hold any office in the land.

"When wicked men bear sway, The post of honor is the private station."

GEN. BRADFORD'S LETTER.

HOLLY SPRINGS MISS., Sept. 1, 1856.

Col. JOHN P. PRYOR: My Dear Sir—Your kind letter of the 28th ult. has been received. It respects asks the position I shall occupy upon the pending Presidential question, and some of the reasons that have determined my course.

I cannot think the public feel any particular interest about my views on this subject; it matters but little what an humble individual like myself may think proper to do in relation to public affairs. Many gentlemen, I am aware in these days, appear to suppose it a great importance to make known to the people the fact that they have changed their political principles; or perhaps, it would be more kind to say, their course of action, in this revolution of political affairs, as well as to communicate their reasons for this important step. But a majority of these gain but little favor in public estimation, beyond the commendations of political partisans anxious to secure success and glad to obtain recruits. This should incline modest men to hesitate about laying their views before the public.

I know your devotion to me as a friend, and that you are sincere in believing that my opinions upon some of the great questions of the day would be of the public mind. As you desire it, therefore, I shall submit a few reasons which influence me to support Mr. Fillmore, and, in doing so, must necessarily touch upon some of the issues involved in the canvass.

There are now in the field three candidates for the Presidency, each at the head of distinct parties: Mr. Buchanan, of the Democracy; Mr. Fremont, of the Black Republican or Free soil party; and Mr. Fillmore, of the American party. The old line Whigs, of whom I am one, (a numerous and conservative portion of citizens,) present no candidate. They are left collectively or individually to determine, according to the best lights before them, which of the candidates they can support with the best hope of perpetuating the Union, and promoting the general welfare of the country. It is the duty of each and every one of them to come to the polls and cast their votes for one or the other of the candidates. As it is said the Union is in imminent danger,

From the time Mr. Fillmore was nominated by the American party, I resolved to give him my support. This I can do with the surrender of any principle I have heretofore advocated; indeed, amidst the revolutions and changes of party I was happily relieved from any embarrassment, when his name was presented to the American people.

In a short time of the inauguration of Gen. Taylor he was removed by death from his high position, and in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the United States, Mr. Fillmore assumed the administration of the government, at a time of great political and sectional excitement, when there was more reason to apprehend a speedy dissolution of the Union, than had ever been witnessed before, since the organization of the government. The clouds of disunion and discontent lowered upon the Capitol to such an extent that in despair the aged, august Senators sat almost paralyzed in their seats, and the many tears trickled down their venerable cheeks, for the safety of the Republic. Many of the firmest and wisest statesmen there, feared that every day's sitting would be the last. But after a long and momentous struggle, by a joint effort of the master and patriotic spirits of all parties, peace was restored and the Union preserved. The influence of no man was more felt in this great pacification and settlement, than that of Millard Fillmore. This great conflict of public opinion growing out of sectional excitement, produced the passage of the series of acts commonly called the Compromise of '50, which in the end gave general satisfaction to the nation; all of which acts were approved and signed by Mr. Fillmore, and again endorsed by him in his annual message, as a final settlement of the subject to which they related. And I am pleased to see these Compromise Measures are now incorporated into the Democratic platform as one of their articles of faith. Mr. Fillmore's foreign policy was highly just and conservative, and met the general approval of the nation.

And finally, when Mr. Fillmore retired from the Presidency, he left the executive chair with the gratitude of his friends, and even extorted from his political opponents admiration and respect, leaving the people of the Union prosperous, peaceful and happy. No one can administer the Government with more firmness, integrity, and impartiality, than he. In all his official acts he seemed to be a stranger to sectional agitation or sectional policy. Mr. Fillmore appears again on the theatre of action, as a candidate for the presidency, living in the midst of the Abolitionists, Free-soilers, and fanatics of the day, where political and sectional excitement is at fever heat. Does he quail in the midst of this tornado? No, no! He exhibits a degree of moral heroism surpassing any living American statesman; and whilst his opponents are sunk into silence by the political whirlwind that seems sweeping over the land, he mounts the heights everywhere, undismayed, proclaiming his sentiments as frankly and as boldly as if there were no breakers ahead. Is not such conduct to be praised? He is, in himself, a host, and would have been in any age or country. Hear him:—"If you want a Chief Magistrate to administer the Constitution and laws impartially, and in every part of the Union, giving to every State, and every Territory, fear or favor, then you may cast your lot for me. I repeat here what I have said elsewhere, that if there be those at the North who want a President who will rule the South, or those of the South who want a President who will rule the North, I do not want their votes. I can never represent them. I stand upon the broad platform of the Constitution and the Laws!" What other man aspiring to the first office of the earth, at the time and under the circumstances, would have uttered these bold and conservative sentiments? I confess I know him not!

I am told that the contest is between Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Fremont, and that it is the part of patriotism to sacrifice opinions, and even principles, to avoid the destruction of our common country. If I knew my vote would avoid imminent danger to the Union, I would surrender for a time all my long cherished opinions of policy and cast my vote with pleasure for Mr. Buchanan. But I am not driven to this alternative, as I do not hold in my hands by any process of reasoning, this awful responsibility. It behooves me to act from the best of my judgment for the common good.

When great public calamities are likely to befall, or imminent danger threatens a nation or a people, of a foreign or domestic character, what has been their policy in every age, and in every country, whether civilized or savage, in selecting their chief rulers or commanders, civil as well as military? Is it not to choose from among the patriots and national men, without regard to classmen, or mere party leaders, men who seem to have a peculiar fitness for the important service required? This is certainly so, and history furnishes many striking examples of the truth of this fact. Indeed in a great majority of instances, the people, either by instinct or judgment, have pointed out the men whose character and qualifications were equal to the occasion. After casting around the whole Union for a man to fill the presidential chair, at this crisis, I have come to the conclusion that no man in this Union can be so safely trusted as MILLARD FILLMORE.

Grave objection is made to the declaration of Mr. Fillmore at Rochester, that he had no suspicion that the Missouri Compromise was disturbed by that of 1850. So far from being surprised at this declaration, I cannot perceive how any one comes to the conclusion that the legislation of 1850 repealed that of 1820. The former applies to one scope of country, the other applies to a different one; and an enactment for one Territory cannot repeal or supersede an enactment for a different one, unless there is an express provision to that effect. The Compromise Measures of 1850 related to the Territory we acquired from Mexico. They established a different principle, it is true, from the Missouri Compromise—that of freedom from restriction; but this was not a repeal of what had been done in relation to other territory. It is true the Utah and New Mexico Bills, two of the Compromise measures, embrace small portions of territory taken from the old Louisiana purchase, and that much they effected, but no more. The bills could su-

percede nothing outside of their limits. All the balance of the Louisiana Territory was left subject to the legislation of 1820 until it should be directly repealed. Mr. Fillmore's declaration is in entire accordance with the facts. He believed that it would be better to let that remain which had existed so long, and had been entered into in a spirit of compromise, than to risk the peace of the country by repealing it.

His language is: "Good faith, as well as the peace of the country, seemed to require that a compromise which had stood for more than thirty years, should not be wantonly disturbed."

His Democratic competitor, Mr. Buchanan, occupies the same position. All his speeches and letters down to the act of repeal, show that he was for maintaining, and even extending it to the additional Territory. He spoke of it as a solemn compact, a measure that saved the Union in 1820, one that is not for the descendants of either party in the present generation to cancel—something "almost as sacred as the constitution." Then, of course, he was opposed to its repeal, and can take no credit on that score. The objection made to Mr. Fillmore, then applies equally to Mr. Buchanan. Mr. Fillmore had nothing to do with the establishment of this line. It was done long before he came into public life. But he does not propose to restore it. He defends the South for accepting the repeal; and he denounces the Black Republicans, who are the champions of the restoration of the line.

As to Squatter Sovereignty:—The provisions of both of the acts organizing the Territories of Utah and New Mexico, reserve the entire authority and control over all territorial laws of the Territory, and that all legislation by the people of the Territories is null and void without the sanction or approval of Congress. Now here is record evidence to show that Mr. Fillmore believes that the people of the Territories have no jurisdiction over the subject matter of legislation, except by grant for that purpose by Congress.

It would be out of the question for me to think of voting for Mr. Buchanan, after he has adopted the Democratic platform at Cincinnati, in all its length and breadth. Many principles and dogmas are affirmed therein, which, in my opinion, if carried out, are well calculated, in time, to subvert our institutions.

The resolution in regard to foreigners, I consider extremely objectionable. They proclaim in this resolution that the doctrines contained in it are those of Jefferson, and were by him embodied in the Declaration of Independence, and are sanctioned by the Constitution. And to make them truly orthodox, the Convention is pleased to say, they "have ever been cardinal principles of the Democratic faith;" and "every attempt to abridge the privilege of becoming citizens and owners of the soil among us ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute book." What parallel can be drawn between the alien and sedition laws, and wholesome and restrictive measures against the settlement of foreign paupers and criminals, and the abandoned canaille of all nations, within our borders? or the extension of the period of naturalization, with a view alone to check the rapid increase of foreign influence on our institutions? I can see no real balance whatever. Verily, we have fallen on evil times; and it behooves all American patriots to look to the preservation of the Union, from more than one domestic danger.

The resolution touching the Kansas Nebraska act is rather extraordinary, for its verbiage and and peculiar tortuous diction, but there is one thing to be gleaned from it and it is this: that it was intended to endorse, and did endorse, the doctrine that the people of the Territories by that act were vested with exclusive jurisdiction over the subject of slavery within their limits. No hair splitting advocate of this Convention can avoid this conclusion, when he looks to the circumstances that surrounded them at the time of the adoption of this resolution; and it is to be deemed as was every interest of the South and with the rights of slavery, and at once as odious to the people of the South as the Wilmot proviso—It will effectually put a stop to the extension of slavery within the Territories.

That this convention knew the effect of their action on the Kansas Nebraska act, is more fully shown by their nomination of Mr. Buchanan for the Presidency, a man who had publicly declared years before that Congress had sovereign and exclusive jurisdiction on the subject of slavery within the Territories.

That this is the construction of their resolution by Mr. Buchanan, himself, is indubitable. By his letter of the 21st of August, 1848, directed to Mr. Sanford, he explicitly declares it to be his opinion, that "Congress has exclusive jurisdiction on the subject of slavery within the Territories," and after his nomination, he declares in substance that, by the Kansas Nebraska act, it is properly vested in the hands of the people, the true legitimate resource of all power. I will do Mr. Buchanan the justice to say, that for once on this subject he seems to be consistent and explicit.

Read the opinion of that distinguished Democrat, the Hon. M. Van Buren, once the Democratic President of the United States, on this subject, in his letter to the Tammany Society, respecting the nomination of Mr. Buchanan, under date of June 28, 1856. After declaring his intention to vote for Mr. Buchanan, he explains and endorses the position he occupies; and then citing the substance of Mr. Buchanan's review of the Nebraska-Kansas act, he says: "From these terms it is too clear to admit of cavil that it was the intention of Congress to clothe the people of the Territory with complete power to exclude slavery from within their respective limits, as well while they continued Territories as in making provision for their exclusion from the State when that transition shall take place. The only question that can be raised upon the act in this regard, must relate to the effect of the grant, that is whether the Constitution authorizes Congress to clothe the people of the Territories with a power to exclude slavery therefrom while the remain Territories. I have not the slightest doubt of the power of Congress to give this authority to the people of the Territories." You have here the construction of the Kansas Nebraska act, in relation to slavery in the Territories, by the Cincinnati Convention, by their nominee for the Presidency, and

by their friend Mr. Van Buren. Now is this not harmonious in the result?—Gen. Cass and all the balance agreeing in the conclusion, yet by a different process of reasoning? This must be what is called Squatter Sovereignty, a doctrine, odious to me, and has heretofore been to the entire South. I cannot pursue this platform further, although there are many other grounds of objection.

I have other objections to Mr. Buchanan which in these exciting and turbulent times should operate with great force against him. As a politician, through his life, he has been vacillating, and unstable in his course. Indeed it seems in his time he has been everything by turns, and nothing long. And just now, the objection of Gen. Jackson comes with peculiar weight—that is, "he wants moral courage." With his general history before us, although he may be a very clever gentleman, what few leading qualities he must have to fill the exalted station of Chief Magistrate over twenty-three millions of people, verging on a state of civil war.

We have tried Mr. Fillmore once when danger threatened our glorious Union, and he conducted the ship of state gallantly through the surging billows of the political storm, like a skillful pilot to the haven of peace and safety, and I will try him on term more.

With one shout for Fillmore and the Constitution, we can rally around his banner a host of loyal, conservative patriots from all quarters, who will bind themselves with hooks of steel, for the preservation of our institutions—such is the magic of a name associated with great and shining qualities, either in a soldier or statesman.

Be assured, sir, that this Union is not to be dissolved without the most horrid struggle ever witnessed in any age or country, and the name of political parties and their leaders will have sunk into oblivion long before we surrender up the priceless legacy bequeathed to us by the wisdom and blood of our fathers.

If the Administration of this government is not now committed to competent and skillful hands, the people will rise in their majesty, and select some "master spirit" who will be equal to every emergency.

I have an abiding confidence in the American people, and they will do right when all that is sacred and dear to us as a nation and as individuals is at stake. As this great struggle advances, the masses, both North and South, will assemble together, and will as it were, by instinct, behold the yawning abyss just opening to engulf them, and will avert these gathering difficulties. Our population are an intelligent, christian, civilized and free people, and are capable of self-government, and will exhibit themselves to the world. They know that the territory of the United States, belongs to all the people of the United States; it belongs as much to one State as to another State, and to one citizen as to another citizen; and that every citizen holding slaves has a right to reclaim a fugitive under the Constitution of the United States. Now, can it be possible that a majority of this mighty people, with all the attributes I have assigned them, will be so unjust, fanatical and fratricidal in their policy, as to refuse the minority their just and equal rights under the Federal Constitution of their fathers? This state of things is scarcely possible. If I am not greatly mistaken, you will see as much peace and brotherly love amongst us as this apparent storm blows over us; you have witnessed for years in this nation. The abolitionists, fanatics and fanatics, from all quarters of the Union, will be seen to hide their reckless and intemperate zeal and after the sober second thought be fully convinced that if they had caught the phantoms they so eagerly pursued they would have been as destructive to all their earthly hopes as the promises of the veiled Prophet of Khorsan were delusive to his numerous devotees. Do not prophesy evil of your country. Admit there is some appearance of danger, but that the virtue and patriotism of the people have ample resources at hand.

"THE UNION—IT MUST BE PRESERVED."

Yours truly,

A. B. BRADFORD.

Good News from Kansas.

St. Louis, Sept. 16.—The Kansas pioneers have been released on five thousand